

## **REMARKS**

In response to the Appeal Brief previously filed by Applicant on October 22, 2008, the Examiner reopened prosecution of the presently pending patent application and issued the instant Final Office Action. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner withdrew the rejection of claims 23-27 and 50 and indicated that these claims are presently in condition for allowance. By the present Response, claims 1-14, 46-47, 49, and 51 are canceled.<sup>1</sup> Claims 16, 28, and 45 are amended to include subject matter indicated by the Examiner as being allowable. Upon entry of these amendments, claims 16-32, 34-45, and 50 will remain pending in the present application. In light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner withdrew the rejection of claims 23-27 and 50 and indicated that these claims are presently in condition for allowance. *See* Final Office Action, p. 45. Based on the Examiner's statements in the Response to Arguments section on pages 45-47 of the Final Office Action, it is Applicant's understanding that the rejection of claims 23-27 and 50 have been withdrawn because the cited prior art of record fails to disclose a dual-port register file having a *first* parallel port for parallelly transferring contents of a register file between a row of a DRAM array and a *second* port for transferring data between the register file and a functional unit, as generally recited in each of independent claims 23 and 50. *See id.* at page 46 (noting the Examiner's comments in paragraph 56). Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating the allowability of these claims.

Moreover, while Applicant does not necessary agree with the Examiner's reasoning for maintaining the rejection of the remaining claims, in the interest of expediting the allowance of the present application, Applicant has canceled claims 1-14, 46-47, 49, and 51, and has amended independent claims 16, 28, and 45 to include subject matter similar to the allowable subject matter

---

<sup>1</sup> Claims 15, 33, and 48 were previously canceled and remain canceled by this Response.

recited by independent claims 23 and 50. As will be discussed further below, it is believed that these amendments place all presently pending claims in condition for allowance. Further, it should be understood that claims 1-14, 46-47, 49, and 51 are being canceled without prejudice and that Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter recited by these canceled claims, as well as the subject matter recited by claims 16, 28, and 45 in their previously presented form, in a future continuation application.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 6-10, 12-14, and 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inagami et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,881,168 (hereinafter “Inagami”) in view of Luk et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,883,814 (hereinafter “Luk”), and further in view of Farmwald et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,243,703 (hereinafter “Farmwald”). In addition, Garcia, U.S. Patent No. 4,827,476 (hereinafter “Garcia”) is cited as extrinsic evidence. The Examiner rejected also claims 2-5 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inagami in view of Luk in view of Farmwald and further in view of Parady, U.S. Patent No. 5,933,627 (hereinafter “Parady”). The Examiner further rejected claims 16-22, 28-32, 34-43, 45, and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inagami in view of Luk in view of Parady, and further in view of Bissett et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,896,523 (hereinafter “Bissett”). The Examiner further rejected claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inagami in view of Luk, and further in view of Krishnamohan et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,499,355 (hereinafter “Krishnamohan”). Finally, the Examiner rejected claim 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inagami in view of Luk in view of Krishnamohan, and further in view of Farmwald, with Garcia additionally cited as extrinsic evidence. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

### ***Legal Precedent***

The burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness falls on the Examiner. *Ex parte Wolters and Kuypers*, 214 U.S.P.Q. 735 (B.P.A.I. 1979). To establish a *prima facie* case, the Examiner must not only show that the combination includes *all* of the claimed

elements, but also a convincing line of reason as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references. *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972 (B.P.A.I. 1985). In establishing a *prima facie* case for obviousness, “the scope and content of the prior art are to be determined; differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are to be ascertained; and the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved. Against this background the obviousness or nonobviousness of the subject matter is determined.” *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727 at 1729 (2007).

***Independent Claims 16, 28, and 45***

As discussed above, Applicant has amended each of independent claims 16, 28, and 45 to recite subject matter similar to the allowable subject matter recited by independent claims 23 and 50. Specifically, each of independent claims 16, 28, and 45 is amended by the present Response to generally recite first and second register files that include: (1) a first port operative to parallelly transfer the contents of a selected register file between an addressed row of a DRAM array; and (2) a second port operative to transfer data between the selected register file and a functional unit.

As set forth in the Final Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the recited feature regarding the second port for transferring data between a register file and a functional unit, as recited by independent claims 23 and 50, was allowable over the cited prior art of record. *See* Final Office Action, p. 46 (noting, in particular, paragraph 56 of the “Response to Arguments” section). Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 16, 28, and 45 are presently in condition for allowance based at least upon the presently submitted amendments. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Section 103 rejections and allowance of independent claims 16, 28, and 45, as well as those claims depending therefrom.

**General Authorization for Extensions of Time and Payment of Fees**

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, Applicant hereby provides a general authorization to treat this and any future reply requiring an extension of time as incorporating a request therefore. Further, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any other fees that may be due at this time or at any time during the pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 06-1315; Order No. MICS:0171-2/MAN.

**Conclusion**

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 23, 2009

/Robert A. Manware/  
Robert A. Manware  
Reg. No. 48,758  
FLETCHER YODER  
PO Box 692289  
Houston, TX 77269-2289  
(281) 970-4545